



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,389	01/04/2000	Andrew Ramsay Knox	UK9-99-004	9176

25299 7590 04/30/2003

IBM CORPORATION  
PO BOX 12195  
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002  
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/477,389	KNOX ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kenny Lin	2154	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheets.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: See attached PCT-892 form.

  
MENG-AI T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

1. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but does not overcome the rejection because:

- a. Applicant argued that none of the cited passage is related to (1) "issuing a request to said portable client computer system via said satellite link to disable portable client computer system" and (2) "a network adapter ... for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request".
- b. As to point (1), In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., satellite link) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- c. As to point (1), Jackson et al taught the claimed invention including a control means for issuing a wake-up request (col.2, lines 3-12, col.4, lines 28-37, 58-65, col.5, lines 38-42, col.6, 2-27, col.8, lines 22-31). Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the control means to issue a request to disable portable client computer system. However, remotely disabling computer system is well known in the art. Furthermore, Jackson et al taught in the disclosure remote boot includes powering up or reboot (col.1, lines 21-30). One would have been motivated to also enable the system to remotely shut down the client computer in order to save power. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to also enable remote power-down in Jackson et al's system to shut down the client computers.

- d. As to point (2), Jackson et al taught the claimed invention including a network adapter, connected to the portable client computer (col.4, lines 47-54), Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the adapter is for disabling portable client computer system. However, remotely disabling computer system is well known in the art. Furthermore, Jackson et al taught in the disclosure remote boot includes powering up or reboot (col.1, lines 21-30). One would have been motivated to also enable the system to remotely shut down the client computer in order to save power. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also enable remote power-down in Jackson et al's system to shut down the client computers.
- e. The method and use of remotely disabling computer system can be found in both Basu, US 5,842,011, and McHann, Jr., US 5,983,353. Specifically McHann, Jr., column 8, lines 4-12, 27-35.

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Basu, US 5,842,011, disclosed remote boot for workstations.

McHann, Jr., US 5,983,353, disclosed activating and deactivating devices by messages.

Connery et al, US 6,311,276, disclosed remote wake-up commands.